

UNITED STATES I 'ARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trader; ark Office

ddress: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FILING DATE 35-95-010.1 \mathbf{D} HOWARD 12/08/99 09/456,647 **EXAMINER** Γ WM01/0321 ROMAIN. DAVID G. WILLE, ESQ ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 2163 DATE MAILED: DALLAS TX 75201-2980 03/21/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

K

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/456,647

Applicant(s

Howard et al.

Examiner

Romain Jeanty

Group Art Unit 2163



	HE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]	
	a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
	b) X expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.	
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.	
	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).	
Ap bu	oplicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Mar 5, 2001</u> has been considered with the following ef It is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:	fect,
X	The proposed amendment(s):	
	🗴 will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.	
	will not be entered because:	
	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).	
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).	
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.	
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
	NOTE:	
		-
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
		
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.	in a
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus	
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action.	5
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus	5
_ X	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the solution of the prior of	5
_ X	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by t Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):	5
_ X	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed:	5
_ X	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by t Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):	5
_ X	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by t Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to:	he
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by t Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 7, 8, and 24-26	he
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: **Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 7, 8, and 24-26 The proposed drawing correction filed on has not been approved by the Examiner.	he
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: **Both the reference(Reilly) and application disclose presenting advertisements based on calculation of time interval. Thus this argument is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the prior Office action. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 7, 8, and 24-26 The proposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)	he